THEOLOGY

VOL. LXI FEBRUARY, 1958 No. 452

Editorial

THEOLOGY is not given to episcopolatry, nor do we number ourselves among those Anglicans who preach it in general without practising it in particular. It used to be the case that weighty Charges issued from episcopal palaces: they often contained erudite animadversions on the theological or ecclesiastical controversies that were being agitated at the time. Whether bishops nowadays have a regular or even an irregular habit of composing visitation and other Charges for the benefit of their diocesans we do not know but, if they do, it seems that either publishers or the authors deem them unworthy of publication. At any rate, they seldom come into our hands. It may be that our bishops have and use means of communicating their thoughts which were not available to their predecessors, and that the old forms are obsolete. However that may be, we are glad that the Bishop of Chester's Charges at the primary visitation of his diocese have been published as a book.

The title he has chosen for the volume, *The Churchman's Duty*,[1] sounds rather dreary, but it conceals a lively introduction to the Church of England as it is seen by a wise prelate of sanguine disposition. Here is as good an answer as is likely to be found in short compass to the perverse suggestion that Anglicans are all at sea about what they are supposed to believe and practice. It could with advantage be read both by church members and by inquirers who really want to know what there is to be said on the subject. The bishop deals with such topics as the "character" of the Church of England, its law and authority and discipline, the domestic problems which it is at present facing, and also with the engagement of Christians in the life of the world. His style is lucid and readable, and he is pleasantly concise.

Nevertheless, we do not follow him entirely. He does less than justice to his own good sense when he says he does not doubt "that, had we a workable code of Church law which embodied the requirements of good legislation, so that we all knew where we stood, there would be released a new outpouring of spiritual power which now lies dormant". He has already admitted that hardly any lawlessness at all exists in the Church of England now.

It is natural that he should be better acquainted with the condition of the Church of England than with that of the Church of Rome. His allusions to Roman Catholicism received some exaggerated attention in the press when they were first made. But we do not

[1] Hodder and Stoughton, 7s. 6d.

think it either true or fair to say that Rome requires in those who submit to her claims "a total renunciation and detestation of *all that* has been previously known of Christ's Church" (our italics). It is also naïve to say that "the Pope speaks infallibly on questions of faith and morals, and the door is closed to further discussion". There is scope for endless discussion by theologians about what the Pope's infallible utterances mean or imply, as could be illustrated from the discussions which have been going on in the Roman Church since the definition of the Assumption—and which, please God, will go on till the end of time.

Finally, before the bishop holds another visitation of his diocese we hope he will have discovered that its western area is properly called "Wirral", not "the Wirral"!

* * * * *

The late Bishop of Coventry was the most unconventional bishop of our time, perhaps of all time. He made an unforgettable impression upon all who came into touch with him. He was a man in whom the flames, rather than the fruits, of the Spirit were always apparent. A dozen of his friends have contrived to produce a memoir of him which catches him to the life, in so far as he can be caught in print and photography: *Neville Gorton, Bishop of Coventry*, 1943–55,[1] edited by Frank W. Moyle. Needless to say it is full of good stories—and of a more refreshing kind than most ecclesiastical anecdotes.

* * * * *

There is an ominous dearth of Anglican, indeed of English, Old Testament scholars, especially of young ones. The consequence is that for a considerable time to come we shall have to depend a great deal on the work of foreign scholars. Particularly welcome is the translation of Professor Ludwig Koehler's *Old Testament Theology*.[2] It is a clear and comprehensive study of the theology of the Old Testament, admirably supplied with citations and references. Those who read it cannot fail to have their understanding of the Old Testament, which is also to say of the Bible as a whole, deepened and enriched. Non-Hebraists should not be put off by the circumstance that the pages are lightly sprinkled with Hebrew words, for these are usually translated or interpreted. The publishers might, however, have used a little more imagination in meeting this difficulty, since only a small proportion of present-day theological students are acquainted even with the Hebrew alphabet.

[1] S.P.C.K., 10s. 6d.
[2] Translated by A. S. Todd. Lutterworth Press, 35s.

Apostolic Principles and Episcopal Practice[1]

It might be held that a bishop learns more in the first few years of his episcopate than in any comparable later period, for everything is fresh, and he sees it with new, if inexperienced, eyes. I venture therefore to offer some thoughts and reflections on the work of a bishop in the contemporary Church. I shall try to relate some aspects of the episcopal task to the example of apostolic authority given us by St Paul, especially as set forth in his correspondence with the Corinthians.

It is of course true that St Paul's position in whatever line of succession the modern bishop claims as preceding him in office is somewhat ambiguous. As an apostle he stood apart from the Twelve, and therefore does not stand directly in that line of succession which originated in the Upper Room or at Pentecost. He was not a bishop in the sense of Phil. 1. 1, where the bishops are a kind of board of elders in the local church; nor was he a monarchical bishop in the Ignatian sense. Yet Clement of Rome sees some connexion with those whom he calls "our apostles"—presumably St Peter and St Paul—and those who worked as "bishops and deacons" in the old Philippian sense, and the modern bishop can find a great deal in St Paul's exercise of pastoral authority which will help him in fixing standards and values in his own work. In one particular, for instance, St Paul's relation to the churches he visited was similar to that of a modern bishop. He represented an authority wider than that to be found in the local church. He checked their customs by those of "the churches of God", in a wider area, and their doctrine by the gospel which he had received. In the same way a bishop, with the authority of his consecration, renewed by his regular meetings with the college of bishops, brings to the local church an authority with roots in the past and ramifications in the present. Like the great apostle, he has to take care to use his authority "for building up and not for casting down". The hasty or irresponsible word is long remembered, and he has to learn sometimes to keep silence even from good words, lest speaking unadvisedly with his lips he wound the weak or quench the smoking flax.

We think first of a bishop's position in a typical modern, highly organized diocese. Writers in THEOLOGY frequently ask that the bishop should be a pastor rather than an organizer or administrator. In practice the two functions are closely related. The bishop exercises a pastoral function through his administration. The bias or emphasis of his work, however, can lean in one direction rather than another, and a diocese is entitled to look for the obvious signs of pastoral concern in its bishop. The emblem of the bishop's office is still the crozier, not the dictaphone or filing system. It is, however, worth noting that even St Paul, in the rudimentary conditions of church life as he knew them, could not avoid paying attention to adminis-

[1] Based on a sermon before the University of Oxford, 27 October 1957, on the text 2 Cor. 13. 10: "The authority, which the Lord gave me for building up and not for casting down."

trative matters. When he travelled with the gifts of the Macedonian churches for the poor saints at Jerusalem he had a companion, "the brother whose praise is in the gospel". This companion, he tells us, was "appointed by the churches" to travel with him, so that "no man should blame him in the matter of that bounty", for—he said—"we take thought for things honourable not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men". It is a far cry from St Paul's collection to all the modern apparatus of diocesan office, board of finance, quota and the rest. But the same principle applies. In order to let the people see that justice is done, that burdens are equitably shared, that all points of view are represented, our vast network of committees seems to be necessary. It is often clumsy enough in operation. Most committees meet only monthly, and the bishop is often tempted to act autocratically in the interval and explain afterwards. But he must usually resist the temptation, for if the Body of Christ is to function as a body, with every member playing his part, he must give time for the church to collect the evidence and form its judgment on the many issues which have to be settled. The bishop must accept the delay, and offer it up to God as a sacrifice directed towards the service of the people's faith. He will in fact repeatedly find that the committee system is something of a façade. When the committee has had its say, only too often the final action is left to the bishop. In this way the bishop's authority, in the sense of *auctoritas*, not *potestas*, is recognized. Legally, he may have no powers in a specific situation. Practically, he is accepted as a representative person, whose knowledge of the whole situation, and whose spiritual status as a consecrated bishop, gives some hope of a satisfactory solution. Such power, like all power, can lead to pride or wilfulness, but it can also humble. While power can corrupt, responsibility can steady or invigorate.

Then there is the task of the bishop in church extension. St Paul based his authority very largely on the share he had been allowed to have in the founding of the churches which he directed and in a measure ruled. "We will not glory beyond our measure," he says; "we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you, for we came even as far as unto you in the gospel of Christ." He did not want to glory "in other men's labours". It was because he had begotten the Thessalonians or the Galatians in Christ that he claimed the right to lead and guide them.

Some of the great bishops of Christian history—an Augustine of Canterbury, a Boniface, a Tucker of Uganda, a Frank Weston of Zanzibar—have been able to lead their people in direct evangelistic enterprise. For most of the long centuries of English church history this has not been possible. The bishop's work was considered to be a pastoral office in the midst of a Christian people. The Industrial Revolution led to a revival of the Church's evangelistic mission, and the uninterrupted growth of our great towns has presented almost every bishop with an evangelistic task at his own door, often in and around his see city. It is not always realized what a great evangelistic enterprise has been carried out by Anglican bishops through the ever-present task of church extension. Bishop Winnington Ingram, firing

the church people of London with enthusiasm to plant the church in the heart of the ever-expanding metropolis, consecrated no less than a hundred churches during his thirty-eight years as Bishop of London. When it is remembered that every one of these churches became a permanent centre of pastoral and evangelistic enterprise (even if of varying effectiveness) the total ingathering of souls by this means must have far exceeded those brought in by sporadic efforts and campaigns.

Like that of most modern bishops, my own task is to take the gospel and the Church to the vast new housing estates situated, in my case, all around the City of Leicester. Every one of these districts of 5,000 or more people is larger than most of the other parishes in my diocese, and only very slowly are we succeeding in establishing church centres within them. To erect a dual-purpose hall, and a parsonage house, now costs £25,000, and, with all the help from the Church Commissioners, stupendous efforts are necessary to raise these sums. My own experience is that while parishes are ready to do a good deal to help their bishop, or to achieve some diocesan target, there are few that are moved with a real evangelistic concern for the new areas. Local problems too often dominate the local scene. There are few tasks in which the bishops more obviously need the support of a praying church than in that of inspiring their people to make the necessary sacrifices in order to plant the church firmly in these great estates. They could so easily grow into great pagan enclaves in our very midst. If they do, the church will repeat in the twentieth century the failures of the nineteenth from which we are still suffering.

Although the bishop's evangelistic mission is most commonly expressed through the work of church extension, there are occasional opportunities to evangelize more directly. On one summer evening I found myself preaching at a country church situated at the gates of Bradgate Park, a great lung for Leicester, where hundreds of people were going in and out of the park, past the walls of the pleasant little churchyard. With some diffidence I told the people that after the Blessing I would ask choir and congregation to follow me out to the churchyard, where from an eminence we would address a few words to the masses outside. They gladly did so, and I had the happiness of leading a group of my people in at least a symbolic act of witness. The crowds gladly listened for a few minutes, and reverently received a blessing before making their journey home. Such moments of opportunity go far to compensate for the heavy load of back-room work which every bishop has to carry.

An important part of a bishop's work lies in the realm of discipline, St Paul had to deal faithfully with serious obstacles to the work of the church at Corinth. Whatever may have been the precise circumstances, he was faced with moral laxity and with rivalry which threatened schism. He did not hesitate to strike, with word and with a spiritual sentence of condemnation, delivered at a distance but, as he believed, none the less powerfully effective on that account. "I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit, have already, as

though I were present, judged him that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1 Cor. 5. 5). These words, which were too easily taken as the authority for inquisitorial burning of heretics in the Middle Ages, nevertheless stand for an inescapable element in apostolic and hence in episcopal authority. How necessary, then, to remember St Paul's other words, twice repeated, where he says that his authority was given him for building up, and not for casting down.

The disciplinary cases which come before a bishop—I am thinking of pastoral, not legal, action—fall mainly into two classes. First, there are the frequent cases where churchpeople, having at some time in the past offended against the church's standard of marriage, seek an authorized return to the privilege of holy communion. A bishop is under the necessity of dealing with such cases, when brought before him, in accordance with a recent Act of Convocation, although he knows that even graver sins against charity pass unnoticed as obstacles to communion in many parishes. Fortunately few apply for restoration who have not already gone a good way along the pathway of repentance, and it is usually possible to welcome them along with all others who find the remembrance of their sins grievous and their burden intolerable. Then there are the sad cases, fortunately few, where clergy or other responsible leaders fall into sins which cannot be overlooked in a society which sets itself a moral standard. I would only mention here one aspect—the public aspect—of such cases. I have found that where it is deemed right after appropriate interval to restore such a one in a spirit of meekness (as St Paul in Galatians tells us to do), it is best to take the laity fully into confidence. Instead of resorting to all kinds of subterfuge, such as removal to distant parts of the country, it is possible to say to the laity "here is a piece of redemptive work in which you can share". I have been touched and encouraged at the way in which simple Christian people have seen the need to share in the burden of risk and responsibility, to receive back into fellowship those who have sinned, and to rejoice with the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth. We may have been too ready to think that the public penance of the primitive Church can have no counterpart in our modern world.

Finally, a word about the bishop's role in the sphere of liturgy and sacrament. The two liturgical functions which, in our Church, are reserved for the bishop are confirmation and ordination. In both of these functions he is closely linked with the clergy and faithful laity of his diocese. In confirmation it is the parish priest who prepares and presents, even if the bishop alone lays on hands. The parish priest must carry the main burden of after-care. This should be stressed, for our Presbyterian friends are reluctant to accept episcopal confirmation, lest it should detract from the pastoral responsibility of the local minister. When a bishop institutes a parish priest he says, "Receive thy cure, my care", or similar words, and this is never

better exemplified than in the co-operative work of preparing, confirming, and caring for confirmation candidates.

I have greatly valued occasional opportunities of conducting services of "threefold initiation"—baptism, confirmation, and first communion. Practical considerations make it necessary for such occasions to be rare, but when they do occur they have a unique value. A small group is baptized; they move forward and join a larger group to be confirmed; finally, all, new communicants and old, communicate together. This sequence makes clear, as I think no other sequence does so well, how a catechumen is initiated into the worshipping community. A less dramatic development, but still an interesting one, is seen in the fact that many modern bishops find it possible to celebrate quite frequently at parish communions in the parishes of their cure. In these ways, with the aid of new church timetables of service, and the motor-car, the modern bishop is enabled to fulfil some of the liturgical functions which attached to the bishop's office in the primitive Church. His relation to churches in new districts, where he retains a greater measure of direct pastoral responsibility than is the case in established incumbencies, restores to him something of the character of a bishop of the fourth or fifth century.

It is hoped that these few notes, growing out of a junior bishop's practical experience, may provide some stimulus to those who are grappling with theological issues concerning the episcopate. During the years when the report on Anglican-Presbyterian relationships is being studied, there will be much discussion, on both sides of the Border, "concerning the bishop's office". What, according to Clement, the Apostles foresaw is likely to be once more fulfilled! The Presbyterians will want to be very sure of what it is they are asked to receive: we shall need to be sure of what it really is that we have to give. Frank discussion of the nature of episcopacy as we know it, in the light both of daily experience and of scriptural and patristic precedent, may be of some value. The more we can see our authority —an authority by no means limited to bishops, but permeating throughout the priesthood, and indeed throughout the *laos*—as an authority always given for building up and not for casting down, the better we may be placed for discussing the function of the episcopate in "the coming great church".

RONALD LEICESTER.

Rational Godliness: A Welsh Controversy

A CENTURY ago, South Wales was the scene of a controversy between Rowland Williams and the Bishops of Llandaff and St David's. It has an interest in that the three most eminent men in the Church in Wales in the nineteenth century were involved, and also in that it has most of the ingredients of the conflicts and movements of thought which convulsed the Church in that century. The background of the controversy is the insularity of theological thought in

England in the first half of the nineteenth century, with its narrow evidential apologetic, based on miracle and prophecy, which had been inherited from the previous century. It was a time when "the theory of a literal verbal inspiration was probably not widely held; its place was taken by a theory of plenary inspiration, or an inspiration of superintendence which preserved the Scriptures from all mistakes except a few minor contradictions, or the errors of copyists. Theologians, however, had never thought out the implications of their views."[1] This statement aptly sums up the position of the Bishop of Llandaff, Alfred Ollivant. There are passages in his Charge of 1857 which suggest a broader outlook, but the reader is left quite uncertain as to the extent to which he will admit the presence of a human element in the Bible. The new movements of thought find greater sympathy from the Bishop of St David's, Connop Thirlwall, as indeed we might expect from one whose translation, in 1825, of Schleiermacher's "Critical Essay on the Gospel of St Luke" earns him a place among the pioneers of biblical criticism in this country. But his sympathy, at least at this time, is tempered with considerable caution and reserve. In the person of Rowland Williams, these new influences are frankly accepted and boldly applied.

Williams was born in 1817. He was the son of Rowland Williams, Rector of Ysceifiog and Canon of St Asaph, who was a prominent figure in nineteenth-century Wales. He was a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and lecturer in Classics from 1842 till 1850, when he became Vice-Principal of St David's College, Lampeter. Sir Thomas Phillips referred to him as "a writer of whom his countrymen are justly proud";[2] the most eminent of the native Welsh clerics, they hoped that a brilliant future awaited him, but his theological opinions soon produced, in South Wales, the kind of situation that he and his fellow essayists produced for the whole country when *Essays and Reviews* was published in 1860. Williams was the Select Preacher at Cambridge in 1854, when his sermons caused a good deal of discussion. The course was interrupted by the death of his father, and of this interruption he wrote in the preface of the pamphlet, *Lampeter Theology*: "I had expected the interruption of my sermons to be termed a divine judgment, but the religious press of England found a keener pleasure in representing it as an academical sentence. Thus the alarm was sounded. My poor countrymen who knew no better caught early at the cry." So, to make his position clear, he published a collection of sermons preached at Cambridge and Lampeter, which appeared in 1855 under the title *Rational Godliness*.

It was essentially a time when large ideas were germinating, a time of the growth of potent spiritual forces, destined to shape the whole thought of mankind. The historical and comparative methods, romanticism, idealist philosophy, and the achievements of physical science are some of the forces that were to transform theology.

[1] V. F. Storr, *The Development of English Theology*, p. 178.
[2] *Wales* (1849), p. 13.

Williams came under the spell of these potent forces, which came to him mainly from the German biblical critics and also from Coleridge. The result is that his sermons show the frank acceptance of the spirit of liberal inquiry into the Bible. Great stress is laid on the human element in the Scriptures. As regards things of earth, they contain the thoughts of fallible men. He asserts the progressive character of the biblical revelation. The records are cast in the mould of the generations in which they were written. They express the conceptions of the times of the writers, and the measure of faith and knowledge to which they had attained. Williams starts from the community, the nation and Church, whose history and growth through various stages the Bible records. The Bible is therefore the voice of the Church, the record of her revelations and the traditions of her spiritual life. Inspiration does not belong to the Hebrew alone, for God has nowhere left himself without witness, but he has given the Spirit in larger measure to those who knew him by his name, Jehovah. The inspiration of the biblical writers is an inspiration which belongs to the community, and that is the abiding possession of the Church. The accepted "evidences" of Christianity are thrust aside. Prophecy found its fulfilment in contemporary history; there is no prediction, rather it resolves itself into type. Miracles are to be judged on their merits and in the light of circumstances. In the Old Testament the poetic element is to be considered. With regard to the miracles of our Lord, the moral element is to be stressed rather than the element of power. The true evidence of Christianity is to be found in the teaching and character of Christ. The results of criticism on the structure and authorship of the books of the Bible are accepted. He endeavours to show that these results do not undermine the faith, as was commonly supposed, but are aids to the understanding of that faith. These themes recur, with varying emphasis, according to the immediate purpose of the preacher, in sermons which in length and style are typical of the period, but which in content and exegesis have a distinctly modern ring.

The immediate outcome was a correspondence with the Bishop of Llandaff, who informed Williams that he understood that a formal complaint about his doctrine was to be made to him. The bishop also regretted that his theory of inspiration was repugnant to him. Williams, in reply, outlined his defence. Scriptural inspiration is a subject on which there has been diversity of view in the past. It was likely that such diversity would prevail if not increase. It was impossible to treat the subject fairly without giving offence to someone, but he has spoken in the fear of God rather than of man. Nothing in the sermons expressly contradicts the Bible, the Prayer Book, or the Articles. He admits, however, that they run counter "to a certain floating tradition". If the sermons are to be the subject of a public appeal, he asks that a distinction should be made between those parts which the bishop personally disliked because they did not express his opinions, and those he episcopally condemned as contrary to the teaching of the Church. He refers to contemporary writers who were moving in the same direction as himself: Arnold, Baden Powell,

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

Wilson, Jowett, Stanley, "and such portions as I understand of Mr Maurice". He ends with some significant words:

"Generally, I think that the Church will tide over the critical time of education into which the next generation will see her thrown. But if she does, it must be, I think, on free waters."[1]

The bishop was not impressed. In his Charge of 1857 he repeats the main defence of the English conservative, that "the rationalism of Germany is being introduced to this country just when continental theologians, sick at heart of the rationalism which for many years has been preying on the vitals of their Christianity, are returning to sounder principles of biblical interpretation". This seems to have been the prevalent opinion in England, but, in reality, Hengstenberg stood almost alone in opposition to the new criticism. He goes on to say that a dark cloud has appeared on the Welsh horizon which, if not dispersed, will result in a storm which will sweep every thing before it and spread desolation all around. Rowland Williams has been seduced by his studies into surrendering a position which no Christian should have abandoned. Infidelity or enthusiasm, according to the character of each individual, are the consequences of the opinions he advocates.

The *Review of Bishop Ollivant's Charge*, which had as a preface a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on Commencement Sunday, 1857, was a scathing attack on the Charge. Williams accused Ollivant of using terms, such as rationalism and the authority of Scripture, with neither definition apart from the floating sentiment or tradition in the mind of his audience, nor argument apart from tendency and inference. He was very put out by the bishop's strange statement that "a Fellow of King's College might speculate on these matters, and no one had the right to complain; but a professor of St David's College had a trust committed to him". This he regarded as a mistrust of the truth of God, an insult to his people and a fatal blow to the college. He has been led by his duty to investigate certain important facts, all of which were being discussed by eminent critics, and he has shown that they are not subversive to the faith. In the discussion of various points on which Williams claimed that he had been misrepresented, there is an interesting attempt to reconcile religion and science on the subject of miracle.[2] He argues on philological grounds for a new definition of the word, which will retain the awe, the wonder and the significance, "and yet divest the miracle from that interfering notion which science boggles at". The suspension of law, he argues, is not in the Hebrew or in the Greek Testament. This was a gallant attempt, pointing in the right direction and using the right methods, even though Thirlwall later poured scorn on it. The main issue between Williams and Ollivant was the inspiration of the Bible. Williams assessed the situation rightly when he said that the bishop was in sympathy with the extreme literalists, even though he knew that

[1] *Lampeter Theology*, pp. 28–34.
[2] *Earnestly Respectful Letter*, pp. 51–2.

their theory of plenary dictation could not be sustained. He was prepared to admit some limitations but with extreme reluctance. Ollivant wrote only a short letter in reply. One is left with the impression that there was nothing for him to say, save to protest against some of the indignities that he had suffered at the hand of this fiery Welshman and to refuse to enter into further discussion.

The Bishop of St David's had been more sympathetic in his treatment of *Rational Godliness* in his Charge delivered in the same year. Thirlwall appears to have been reluctant to deal with the matter, but it had become necessary because a demand had been made, signed by seventy beneficed clergymen of the diocese, for the removal of Williams from his post at Lampeter. He refused to comply with this demand. There were, he said, no grounds for such a procedure. He had, however, suggested to Williams privately that it would be better if he were to leave. He pointed out that Williams did not touch upon the Articles but was concerned with the mode of the Divine Communication. It was also significant that the sermon which had given most offence had been preached before the University of Cambridge, which had since conferred a Doctorate in Divinity on the author. The theory of plenary inspiration was not to be set up as a common measure of truth to which all are to conform. The Church has not delivered any dogmatic determination on the infallibility of Scripture. Her ministers have been left free to inquire for themselves. His criticisms are that Williams was lacking in clarity of definition, and that the ultimate tendency of the book was to efface the distinction between natural and revealed religion.

Williams remained at Lampeter, unmolested but unpardoned. In 1859 he accepted the parish of Broadchalke, Wiltshire, of which King's College is the patron, though he did not take up residence there until 1862. He had not been satisfied with Thirlwall's Charge. He had expected more from that quarter. He regarded the Charge as evasive, and it may be said that there was enough in it to offend the confident young vice-principal. So before leaving Wales he resolved to seek a more definite statement from his diocesan. To that end he published the *Earnestly Respectful Letter to the Lord Bishop of St David's*. In the course of this letter he poses six cardinal questions by which, he says, he stands or falls. The questions are concerned with biblical problems, the human element, the idea of revelation being progressive, biblical criticism, and the comparison of the moral standards of the Old Testament with fair parallels from the Gentile world. Unfortunately the letter was anything but respectful. Williams was rash and also ungracious in offering Thirlwall caustic expression and provoking sarcasm. A very angry bishop replied, giving full vent to the crushing sarcasm for which he was renowned. This pamphlet, which coming from Thirlwall might well have been expected to be of importance, proves to be very disappointing. Contemporary readers may have heard the bones of his adversary crack on every page, but when allowance is made for the clash of personalities, the comment of Tait is seen to be the more acute, for he "regretted the captious reply to the eccentric professor, when what

the Church desires is a bold and positive statement".[1] This Thirlwall would not or could not give. The six questions are brushed aside, his legal mind finding so many tacit assumptions underlying the questions that he can claim—quite unnecessarily—that they are meaningless to him, and also reiterate his charge of obscurity of expression. The translator of Schleiermacher appears to have parted company with the German biblical critics; of these he says: "You have before you, I hope, many more years than I have counted since my acquaintance with these speculations began. The result . . . has been to breed distrust rather than confidence. My confidence is sometimes in nearly inverse proportion to that which is expressed by the authors themselves."

There was, however, a fundamental disagreement between the two men in their attitude to the Bible. While Thirlwall was prepared to admit the right of freedom of inquiry, yet for him the Bible was "the one original and unique record of all the revelation that mankind has ever received or could expect, and which stands alone and apart from all other writings".[2] He regarded Williams' concern for bringing the Gentiles into the sphere of revelation as a failure to distinguish between natural and revealed religion, and his conception of the continuity of inspiration as a dangerous concession to the Romanist. Williams' attitude to the Bible was conditioned by historical criticism and by the comparative study of religion; his own contribution to this field of study was published in 1856.[3] He, like Jowett, felt acutely the difficulty of maintaining a sharp antithesis between natural and revealed religion, in the light of what he saw as the greater comprehensiveness of the Divine dealing with men. The second objection had no weight with him. To set up the Bible as too great an external authority was, he thought, fraught with danger. Free inquiry was of the utmost importance; he comments very acutely on contemporary exegesis: "If the Bible means all these things, we may shut our lexicons and draw lots for the sense when, I'm afraid, Protestants will not win the lottery."

It would be superfluous to embark upon a critique of Williams' thought. Much for which he contended has passed into common currency. His errors, which are typical of the early liberals, have been rejected. But the course of events in Wales explain the aggressive tone of his contribution to *Essays and Reviews*. It provides a commentary on a remark in a letter in which he wrote: "An essay or review may be allowed a touch of sarcasm which would not be so proper in a sermon; and I had paid beforehand in my Lampeter purgatory a sort of price which I took out a little in some caustic turns of expression."[4] The first half of the nineteenth century was a time when the tendencies and movements of thought were greater than the men. The interest of this controversy is that it shows the fear and reluctance to come to grips with the problems which arose

[1] Davidson and Benham, *Life of Archibald Campbell Tait*, 3rd Edition, I, 306.
[2] *Letter to the Revd Rowland Williams, D.D.*, p. 35.
[3] *Christianity and Hinduism*.
[4] *Life and Letters of Rowland Williams* (1874), II, 102.

from these new ideas, in the case of one who before his appointment to the See of Llandaff had been the Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and of another who was counted one of the most learned of his age. It shows, too, the failure of two great men to meet their opponent on grounds that had become inevitable, those of historical criticism. Williams' strength was that he was left alone in it.

O. W. Jones.

Biblical Authority and Interpretation

Since the Bible lives within the divine-human mystery of the whole Christ, all Bible reading has to be seen in relation to the Church's corporate use of Scripture. Whatever the reasons may be, the private use of the Bible is not now what it once was; doubtless wild statements made about science proving the Bible to be wrong have something to do with this; the press features bold, if not always accurate, assertions, while the latest discoveries are published for all to admire. Excellent organizations like the Bible Reading Fellowship pass on the fruits of scholarship in digestible form to the faithful reader. "The prevalent doctrine about scriptural inspiration largely determines the use men make of the Scriptures. When verbal inspiration was held men nourished their souls on the Scriptures, and knew that they were fed. Liberal enlightenment claims to have opened the scriptural casket, but there appears now to be nothing inside—nothing, anyhow, which ordinary people feel moved to seek through the forbidding discipline of spiritual reading."[1] There is, we may say, a divine thing and a human thing in the Bible. St Irenaeus saw no need to go much further than this in talking of the Eucharist; Christology has found it difficult to venture safely even within the Chalcedonian boundaries; an adequate doctrine of the Church must allow that it is at once the Body of Christ and a body of sinners. The theologian must walk as delicately in approaching the mystery of Holy Scripture. Three admirable theologians have recently addressed themselves to this task.[2]

False emphases need little encouragement to gain currency; where Scripture and the Lord of Scripture are concerned, the pious mind lapses most easily into monophysitism, for the devout fix their eyes on the divine, so that they no longer know how to see the human. Biblical monophysitism is usually called fundamentalism (a title Fr Hebert helps to explain, though it is not a particularly good one, nor generally welcomed by the people whose views it describes). Its basic error is to forget the humanness of the Bible, and, in neglect-

[1] A. M. Farrer, *The Glass of Vision* (1948), 36.

[2] *The Authority of Scripture: a study of the Reformation and Post Reformation Understanding of the Bible.* By J. K. S. Reid. Methuen, 25s. *Biblical Interpretation: the old difficulties and the new opportunities.* By E. C. Blackman. Independent Press, 12s. 6d. *Fundamentalism and the Church of God.* By Gabriel Hebert. S.C.M. Press, 7s. 6d. and 15s.

ing one half of the mystery, to distort the other; just as some monophysites proposed a Christ no more fully divine than he was truly human, so the fundamentalist, in discarding the humanness of the Bible, also does much less than justice to the ways in which the Word of God is spoken to man in the Scriptures. At the other extreme, many of the liberal theologians treated the Bible as human and no more, an inspiring example of religious literature; in the days of liberalism triumphant, a tragic divorce between the critical and devotional uses of the Bible took place, tragic for scholarship and devotion alike. The work of more recent theologians has changed all that; it has insisted that the Bible could not be properly understood save by those who tried to hear and obey the Word of God proclaimed therein. The new view insists that the Church is an integral part of the Gospel; there is a whole school of "biblical theology" with large and even extravagant claims; there is a renewed interest in the relationship between the Old and the New Testaments, in the patterns of divine activity in redemption, in the typological exegesis of Scripture; closely related to these developments have been the study of the Bible in the context of the liturgy, and the interpretation of Scripture and tradition within the life of the people of God. The change of feeling is very marked; it would be too early and too much to say that the marriage bond between criticism and devotion has been indissolubly tied, but there has been something more than a flirtation and a valid union may be hoped for. In the meantime students of the Bible should pause to pay homage to the great men of the liberal era, for it is all too easy and too common to use their work while abusing their names. Mr Blackman has an excellent chapter in his book, outlining the results and the limitations of the critical method. More recent studies have, in fact, meant the driving out of bad criticism by good, the replacement of a scholarship resting on imported presuppositions by one finding its principles within the world of the Bible itself. Rigorous criticism of this kind will always be needed, and the Christian believer need have no fear that his faith will be undermined by it.

The Bible is not only human, but also divine; it is not only the words of men, but somehow or other the Word of God also. How this is so is the mystery, and, as we are dealing with a divine-human mystery, there can be no tidy solution; anyone claiming to provide one would be paddling in the shallows, while the heart of the Bible is in the deep waters beyond. A conservative evangelical friend of Fr Hebert put the question to him like this: "How does the Word of God come to us in Holy Scripture, and how is this Word of God to be distinguished from the words of men?" Fr Hebert comments: "The Word of God is the Word which he has spoken, and still speaks. It is his Word, and calls for our entire acceptance and obedience. The words of men, spoken and written, belong to this world; and the written words of men are subject to literary and historical criticism. The Bible consists of words of men; hence there must be literary and historical criticism of the Bible. But through those words of men the Word of God has been spoken and still

speaks."[1] He concludes that the study of the Bible must be conducted in a spirit at once humble and docile, and alert and critical. A good deal can be gleaned from our three books on the relation of the Bible to the Word of God, with references to the fathers, the scholastics, the reformers and modern writers. Far too little is available on the history of biblical interpretation in the Church; Dean Farrar's Bampton Lectures suffer from their author's unsympathetic temper, and Fr Hebert wanted to rename the book "The History of Misinterpretation";[2] a solid and substantial work is badly needed, but for the moment gratitude is due to Mr Blackman and Professor Reid for the historical sections in their books. The style of the former is somewhat brash in parts, and not all readers will be happy with a literary method which can conclude a paragraph with the exclamation, Hallelujah. The author divides his "development of exegesis" (chapter 4) into four: (*a*) rabbinic exegesis, (*b*) allegory—Philo to Augustine, (*c*) medieval exegesis, (*d*) the reformation and after. Blackman is able to summon up considerable reserves of sympathy even for the quainter methods of exegesis. As his sub-title indicates, Professor Reid concentrates on a smaller field; well-documented chapters bring out the contrast between the freer approach to Scripture in Calvin and especially Luther, and the rigid scholasticism of the succeeding generations, which saw the birth of the doctrine of verbal inerrancy and fundamentalism as normally understood; by then the authority of the infallible book had wholly replaced the authority of the infallible church, and the only escapes were into rationalism and pietism. Reid also has a chapter on the Roman view, where he makes some apt criticism of the official documents and quotes freely from popular writers. Often enough, indeed, for the Roman dogmatic theologian scriptural texts come in only to clinch a demonstration elaborated on quite different principles, and there is little attempt to understand the world of the Bible itself; but Reid has failed to do justice, despite his remarks on pages 149 ff. of his book, to the new spirit in Roman biblical study.

In the course of the same chapter, Reid properly attacks the Roman equation of Scripture and tradition as sources of doctrine; but he never works through to any understanding of the relation of Bible to Church. He may write that the doctrine of the infallible book is the teaching of an age later than the Reformation itself, but the religious mind pines for authority, and the reform offered to meet the need in the pages of Scripture. In a later and splendid chapter, Reid gives an account of Barth, Brunner and "the theology of the Word", in which those who too glibly talk of Barth's anti-intellectualism will be firmly corrected. This theology allows a much more open approach to the Bible than that of Protestant scholasticism, one which is reminiscent of the Reformation fathers themselves. Impressive as this theology is, it goes astray by treating the

[1] Hebert, op. cit., 10 f.
[2] Hebert, *The Authority of the Old Testament* (1947), 267, n. 2, a useful bibliographical note.

Bible in vacuo, and not in the context of the whole supernatural activity of God; to parody a judgment of Dr J. A. T. Robinson, you can make your theology of the Bible as high as you will, provided your doctrine of the Church is higher still. An adequate theology of the Bible must examine how the Scriptures came to be written within the life of the Old and the New Israel; much of the literature is occasional in type, much also will have a cultic or liturgical setting. Israel is prior to the Bible, the people to the book; the authority and supernaturality of the Bible derive from God's supernatural act in the election of Israel, in the Incarnation of his Son and in the renewal of his people in the body of his Christ. Similarly, the mystery of scriptural inspiration is best examined in the context of the inspiration of God's people; the inspiration of the minds of the sacred writers is a proper study,[1] but it is not what Christian tradition has normally meant by the inspiration of Scripture. God's primary revelation is Christ himself, Christ as the fulfilment of Israel in the saving remnant of his divine-human Person, and as the head of the new Israel in his Temple-Body, with the Spirit proceeding from him to restore the divine presence among men on earth. Here is discernible the supernatural act of the one God; the Bible's supernaturality and inspiration lie within this larger work of the Spirit. The reformed theology, and more especially the theology of the Word, in neglecting this cannot but construct a top-heavy account of the Bible.

We cannot, it seems, discuss the authority and inspiration of the Bible without reference to the Church; and when we come to the interpretation of the Bible's meaning, the Church's use of Scripture is all-important. At one time the liturgical use of the Bible provided a standing check on the extravagances of individual allegorists; at another, the divinity of the Bible was preserved in this way, when all learned energies were being expended on analytical and scientific work. All are agreed that the literal sense of Scripture must be fathomed first; for this task the scholar has a rich array of tools, historical method, comparative religion and culture, religious psychology and anthropology, textual and literary criticism, lexicography, archaeology and so on. As the study goes on, we see how impressively human the Bible really is; there is nothing extraordinary at first sight in the religion, the mythology, the sacred persons and performances, even the bare bones of the history behind the Old and the New Testaments; parallels with non-biblical life and religion are innumerable; and yet all this is the stuff out of which a unique, supernatural revelation is made, witnessed to in these human pages. The Christian mystery takes into itself a good deal from the cultic pattern lying behind the psalms and often attacked by the prophets, and from the language and thought-forms of the Hellenistic religions. Indeed, recent study of the psalter, especially by Scandinavian scholars, opens up a promising line of Christian interpretation. I refer to the royal cult of the Jerusalem temple, which provided the setting for a number of the psalms, and one point of departure for

[1] Cp. Farrer, op. cit., III; and his chapter on Revelation in *Faith and Logic*, edited by Basil Mitchell (1957).

the Servant-theme. In a very striking way, the mysteries of the dying and rising Christ are prefigured in these psalms, in particular by the ritual humiliation and suffering of the Anointed One and his deliverance when the Lord brings salvation in the morning. When the Christian recites these psalms in the regular course of the divine office, he will not find it difficult to recite them in the person of the true King-Messiah, remembering the perpetuation of his mysteries in the life of the Whole Christ, the Church. This example of a Christian interpretation of the Old Testament needs much more working out, but it seems to be a valid example of the "spiritual sense of Scripture" arising directly from the literal sense, a literal sense here discerned only through the unlikely disciplines of comparative religion and culture. The skeleton of the Christian interpretation can be found in the books of the Old Testament scholars themselves.[1]

Though the literal sense can offer high lessons in spirituality, there is general agreement that Scripture has also a spiritual sense. Discussion is bedevilled by the various terminologies used: allegory, typology, homology, prefiguration, spiritual sense, mystical interpretation, fulfilment of prophecy—all these terms occur apart from the older classifications. The books being noticed touch on the topic, though none comes firmly to grips with it; Fr Hebert has dealt at greater length with it previously in his valuable books *The Throne of David* and *The Authority of the Old Testament*. Reid provides some useful material in his final chapter with sections headed "The Bible is the book about Jesus Christ", "The relation of the Bible to Jesus Christ", "The biblical pattern", "Jesus Christ in the Old Testament", "The attitude of Christ to the Old Testament". He is suspicious of typological exegesis, though his criticisms apply more readily to allegory; for the allegorist wants to treat the Bible as a uniform repository of eternal truth discernible in every part; the allegorist is, therefore, indifferent to the historical, and Reid rightly wants to distinguish the witness of the Old Testament to Christ from that of the New, especially by means of the categories of promise and fulfilment. Typology, on the contrary, is very conscious of its historical foundation. Blackman's distinction may help here: "Allegory (is), properly speaking, a literary method applied to the text of Scripture, whereas typology is strictly a method of interpreting events of history and thus not on the same plane as allegory, because not directed in the first place to the literary texts."[2] Professor Daniélou, though criticized by Blackman, would also want to insist that typology is not a sense of Scripture, but a sense of the scriptural events.[3] There are now available the sane conclusions of Professor Lampe and Mr Woollcombe in their book *Essays in Typology* in the S.C.M. Studies in Biblical Theology series. Typology, as opposed to allegory,

[1] A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (1955), especially 131 ff.; H. Ringgren, *The Messiah in the Old Testament* (1956), 24, 66 f.; A. Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (1955).

[2] Blackman, op. cit., 102.

[3] Cp. his article in THEOLOGY, LVII (1954), and his *Sacramentum Futuri* (1950).

is a thoroughly biblical and historical method of understanding the Bible, and should go hand in hand with a study of the biblical "theology of history" involved in the relation of the two testaments. The twofold truth that the Old Testament prophecies have come to pass in the new age inaugurated in Christ and have yet to come to pass at its consummation suggests that the medieval anagogical sense still has its uses. Yet this typological exegesis all too easily gets out of hand, as Blackman finds in the work of Wilhelm Vischer, Farrer and Thornton.[1] Doubtless he is right in points of detail, but the Christian's debt to these writers is very great, in that they have recovered the traditional use of the Bible and one of the keys to its full understanding; for the Christ-event cannot be communicated without reference to the great images, with which Christ clothes himself, or to the saving history which he at once fulfils and transcends in his own person; the new Creation, the new Exodus must be seen in the light of that "Genesis-Exodus mystery" (the phrase is Thornton's), which was already being re-interpreted within the Old Testament itself. Christ is the centre of Scripture; Christ is the content of Scripture; the spiritual sense of Scripture is, in the last resort, Christ himself, as Luther well saw. What the exegete needs is a set of criteria for typological exegesis, so that scientific as well as devotional value can be given to this broad conclusion.

The recovery of typological exegesis is bound up with our understanding of the poetic and symbolic nature of biblical language. It is at this point that fundamentalism reveals its most glaring weakness. Michael Roberts wrote that, if fundamentalism had the Bible for its mother, it had Hobbes for its father.[2] Compared to an earlier age, when the symbolic, poetic, parabolic nature of the Bible was taken for granted, so that a doctrine of inerrancy could do no great harm, fundamentalism reasserts the principle of inerrancy in a materialistic age, when factual, scientific, prosaic statement is alone admissible as truth. Hence fundamentalism completely misunderstands the "truth" of the Bible, a principle rightly used by Hebert as more positive than that of inerrancy. He shows how the I.V.F. commentary on the Bible, for all its excellences, too often fails to plumb the deeper insights of a book in its anxiety to defend the literalist interpretation. Yet the method continues to attract many, and one hopes that conservative evangelicals will read Hebert's book for its charitable and constructive criticism of the whole religious system of which fundamentalism is a part; and that others will read it as a model of what Christian controversy should be like as well as for its intrinsic worth. Perhaps it is less easy to see the danger of what may be called the "higher fundamentalism", which would have us confine our theological discourse and preaching to the biblical words and images themselves. Certainly the biblical language, imagery and thought-forms need to be very thoroughly studied, for they belong to a particular period

[1] Cp. further his essay, "The Task of Exegesis", in W. D. Davies and D. Daube, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (1956), 3–26.

[2] *The Modern Mind* (1937), 86.

and are to the modern mind odd. The contemporary expert is in a much better position than his predecessor to understand what the human words, containing the Word of God, are trying to say. This is but the first stage; the dangerous work of translation, of communication, then begins. At this stage there is much talk of the baby and the bath-water, and certainly the liberal attempt to extract a spiritual kernel from the archaic husk was ill-conceived. Thornton, however, with his metaphor of the onion which is peeled away to leave nothing, goes to the other extreme and incurs the just criticism of Blackman; that way lies "higher fundamentalism". Every biblical sermon involves the work of translation and communication, and every preacher tries to enter the particular minds of his particular people; beyond that, the greater principles cry out to be formulated. The demythologizing controversy suggests that the attempt to read the Bible as it speaks of the condition of man may be a starting-point for some contemporary minds. For most the homely use of parable and poetic language remains of value; but the work has hardly begun; in parish and congregation as well as in the scholar's study, the task of seeing and communicating the divine-human mystery of Holy Scripture must continue. D. W. Allen.

Letter from Korea

In days when children had nurseries they learnt that "prudence is a virtue" and were advised "possess it if you can . . .", this being followed by a most imprudent statement of mere whim about which of the two sexes possessed it at all. But it is a virtue: defined, indeed, as both an intellectual one and a cardinal moral virtue by all theologians since Aquinas.

I would dare to say that the history of the Christian religion in Korea, comprising 200 years of glorious and frequently heroic Roman Catholicism, and 75 or so years of equally vigorous and inspiring and suffering witness by other Churches, has now for long been marked by a quite extraordinary lack of prudence. The Churches of Korea now lack intellectual prudence in the sense that they are often blindly uncritical: they lack moral prudence in that the dark afflictions of war, privation and enemy occupation have caused them with tragic frequency to deliver themselves over to expediency and opportunism. It is easy to say that the Christian Churches of Korea and the nation itself have been pauperized since 1950 by indiscriminate "relief" from overseas. This may well be so but, if it is, then the alternative to pauperization was to risk mass disease and starvation. Moreover, if pauperization is admitted, it must be admitted because too generally the United Nations' attitude has been one of pouring relief goods into Korea primarily to prevent Communism, and of strengthening Christian Churches as the only defence against that same fear from across the 38th parallel. They, too, have mistaken their true end for means so that, it is a hard saying but a necessary one, the United Nations in Korea have by their public and private

actions been the first to give an example of lack of critical sense and of prudence. The Korean people have been ready pupils of all this.

It is generally agreed that Korea has the highest percentage of Christians among its population of any country in the Orient. The President of the Republic and his lady are recorded in the newspapers on most Sundays to have attended an army chapel or drumhead service; the Vice-President, Mr Chang, is a devout Roman Catholic, whose sons and daughters seem all to be training for the priesthood or postulants of convents. But the Vice-President now scarcely ever ventures out of his house since being wounded in an attempted assassination. He represents the "Democratic" as opposed to the Presidential "Liberal" party and was perhaps "kicked upstairs" to this innocuous post. Both parties claim an eminently respectable democratic viewpoint, but there is a tragic association in Korea to-day of democracy and Christianity which does not prevent the bitterness of party faction but yet allows them both to regard Christianity as the handmaid of democracy in the struggle against Communism, a bastion in the fight for freedom provided she does not demand true freedom of the spirit for herself.

This, too, is a hard saying, since courtesy and generosity are so universally shown by Korean officials to Christians, and especially to missionaries, since every army unit appears to have its chapel, every small town its several church buildings. But I think it must be said, however heavily exposed to Christianity most of the country has become. Of that, on the face of it, there is no doubt. In the market town in which until recently I had my parish, within four years I saw Methodist, Presbyterian, "Holiness" and Seventh Day Adventist churches newly built, and also a large Roman Catholic school. We ourselves built a second church fifteen miles south and deep in the country, and within that radius numerous little chapels blossomed out from nowhere. What could be disquieting in all this?

It is undoubtedly disquieting that the Presbyterian Church, magnificent in its early pioneering work of evangelism, Bible schools, hospitals and secular schools should now be split into three bitter factions; it is undoubtedly disquieting to find how unsacramental and often how fundamentalist the Protestant Churches here have become; it is terrifying to contemplate the enormous "hand out" of relief ration which is given by the Roman Catholics and by Church World Service, the latter in particular having been designed to help Korea as a whole, but to a massive extent having become diverted to a church building program. As a delightful, non-Christian Korean undergraduate once said to me: "To a Korean, priest is good job." Too often, also, Church is good business, it helps one to get on!

In all of this it is the lack of prudence, particularly of a critical faculty and of a sense of moral worth which is most disquieting. This is by no means confined only to religion. The National Art Exhibition last month was a good example. Here were brilliant, imaginative and creative works thrown side by side with thoughtless imitations and lushly sentimental art. So often a similar pattern is to be found lacking a faculty of criticism. The quickness of imagina-

tion and the rapid ability to learn difficult techniques, native to Koreans, go hand in hand with an often tragic inability to maintain machinery or buildings or forest land. Their wonderful mastery of social and community life at the village level is vitiated by blatant and grossly selfish corruption at higher levels, and this literally tears social life and institutions to pieces, and is crowned by a Government which is wicked and yet genuinely well-meaning, corrupt because it cannot apply self-criticism.

And yet, of the individual, as of the village, it is frequently so different. As a missionary one is constantly humiliated to find that though one's moral sense and judgment seem superior to that of Koreans, yet that in charity and courtesy and cheerful endurance one is far outstripped. With his lack of a critical faculty, a Korean will readily allow the Cross on an Altar to be six inches out of alignment, or will stuff the broken pane of a church window with a ball of newspaper. I would not see fit to allow this bad and insensitive thing, but, on the other hand, in patience and tolerant forgiveness of slights how much better than mine is his sense of true alignment!

In a country in which the Roman Catholics, Presbyterians and Methodists in particular have exerted very great influence on national life, that of the 67-year-old Anglican Communion is mortifyingly tiny. But because here Christianity is often yoked to democracy and even to politics, the prime influence has been given through Missions emanating from the U.S.A. In the Protestant Churches this seems to be causing an exaggeratedly "Pan-Protestant" approach in spite of the Presbyterian factions; this Pan-Protestantism is weak and indeterminate in theology and especially in any theology of the sacraments. It may well be true, therefore, that the vocation of Anglicanism here will become more one of a "mission to the Churches" rather than to a nation. The Anglican Communion has been far from perfect in judgment, prudence and critical ability through its decades of work; it has sometimes appeared to lack ardour and zeal and even charity. But by beauty of worship, soundness of doctrine and, dare one say, integrity, it preserves much without which Korean Christianity might scarcely survive. Any serious scheme of Christian unity may be fifty years away from us here, but against that day and in the face of a frighteningly uncritical approach to matters of conduct and theology, the Anglican Communion has a calling to stand fast and be true to itself.

Last week I passed an army barrack door with, over it, the single Korean word "Example". It seemed a rather crude piece of moralizing just there, but here am I offering the same advice and stressing the giving of example as our church calling. Obviously it cannot be self-conscious and will not appear unless our life is hid with Christ. However, in our few, but outstandingly beautiful, churches and in spite of the fact that we no longer have work of formal education, this should be our offering to the imprudent, uncritical Korean of post-war and post-captivity, an offering which can be made to him only when it has first been made to God. PAUL BURROUGH.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Williams has been Bishop of Leicester since 1953.

The Rev. O. W. Jones is Warden of the Church Hostel, Bangor.

The Rev. D. W. Allen is Chaplain of St Stephen's House, Oxford.

The Rev. Paul Burrough is on the staff of the Anglican Church Mission at Seoul.

CORRESPONDENCE

NATIONAL SERVICE AND THE ORDINAND

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

MY DEAR SIR,

Whilst I agree that it has been a good thing for ordinands to win private virtue out of public necessity I wonder whether the Rev. Sydney Evans appreciates how difficult it is for a young man of 18 to *reflect* upon his immediate experience whilst he is in the army. Reflection requires more maturity and an easier process of detachment than is normally possible. Opportunity exists. I had ample time, forty years ago, on the night watches outside Buckingham Palace and in the mud of Flanders but I could not *reflect*. I used my mind in the two ways which were permitted to men who were in for the duration. I kept part of it alert to the job itself. I kept the other part for excursions into phantasy. There was great need of both. Appreciation of immediate experience and evaluation of "life as a whole" (what a silly phrase!) were both possible if they were kept in remote balance at the end of each arm's length. Sanity required that neither drive the other out of the inner heart. As a day-school boy (as are many of our ordinands) I had no need of such balancing exercises until I was 18. My mental and spiritual exercises were much too intense for "reflection" to be a fair name. All this, I think, we need to remember if we are to consider either national service or some equivalent displacement as a useful part of pre-ordination life.

If a student keep himself as spiritually and mentally alert in his relationships with his fellow-students as he does in his own increase he will surely find in his own college sufficient vigour and variety, sufficient vainglory and conscientiousness, sufficient discipline and shiftlessness, to open to him the way of meeting nearly every type of man. In his parish he will eventually find just the same people in just about the same proportions, only they will move at different speeds, express themselves by using different instruments, and mature much more quickly under his eyes.

Many ordinands, however, have never seen for themselves at close quarters how different are these instruments and how various are these speeds. If military service be no longer necessary as a means of discovery that age-groups are really people, then let these students do vacation work.

Let them be sent to towns where they have no ameliorating friends

and to jobs they do not know. Let them be put to work by bosses and union men who have agreed to make them work. Let conditions and the length of time be just sufficient to force them into routine jobs which they must continue to sustain long after exhaustion of muscle and mind leaves no energy save to contemplate the inadequacy of the means of assuagement and recreation that are normally available to the full-time worker. Then let reflection be made upon the point at which, the speed with which, and the means by which "phantasy thinking" takes charge. All else can be learned from books.

But let it be an honest scheme. An ordinand getting down into the industrial process to see how it works and how men stick it is a good thing. An honest workman is a good thing. But an ordinand pretending to be a workman is neither honest nor good. We have had enough of angry young men with histrionic gifts who clock themselves into level terms on factory floors. Let ordinands be known for what they are. Then they will be respected for what they do and they will get an honest deal.

11 Eastmoor Road,
Wakefield.

Yours sincerely,
George Pontefract.

BIBLE AND TRADITION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

No one interested in the progress of an eirenic theology, working for the solution of the contradictions and oppositions which make up the doctrinal diversity of Christendom, can fail to be grateful for the sermon on Bible and Tradition printed in your December number. There is encouragement in the view, surely implicit in it, that the historical method, an absolutely indispensable tool in the hands of the theologian, can be a dangerous master if it is held to be the ultimate and decisive criterion of truth and falsehood in biblical interpretation.

But what exactly *is* this closed system theology which bars the road to Christian reconciliation? I suspect that here we are chasing what a recent Theology reviewer has called the tired old fox dubbed "propositional theology". (I wish he had said propositional revelation, for I think that is what he means; but theology is not, strictly speaking, revelation.) If I am right I beg to proffer two quotations by way of elucidation:

> The truth of the faith is contained in Scripture in a scattered manner and in widely differing fashions, and in some of these ways obscurely. To draw out the truth of faith from the Scriptures requires long study and labour which cannot be undertaken by those for whom knowledge of the truth is necessary, because they are too busy or incapable of such study. And so it was necessary that clear summaries (creeds and definitions) should be compiled which set before all compendiously what is to be believed; these are not something added to Scripture but taken from it (*Summa Theologica*, 2a 2ae, I, 9 ad 1).

St Thomas, of course, represents the classical tradition of Catholic

theology; his works, it is said, lay on the table at the Council of Trent along with the Bible. The wide extent of his teaching on revelation is, as it were, crystallized in this passage. Its implications show that the preacher's interpretation of the Tridentine decree on Scripture and Tradition is a caricature. He regards this caricature as characteristic of Catholicism in what he terms its embattled state. Furthermore, this passage is evidence that Père Bouyer's interpretation of the decree which the preacher quotes with approval as offering possibilities of an escape from that state, is altogether in line with St Thomas and traditional Catholic theology.

St Thomas is saying, in the article containing this passage and the one next to it, that the *articuli fidei* are not God's Word in revelation; they are man's word responding in faith to what has been revealed, by an expression of revelation which, though true, is not exhaustive of the mystery it expresses. The creeds are uttered in the person of the believing community, the Church, which is united by faith (9. ad 3). It is the office of the Supreme Pontiff to sanction by his authority new creeds, when they are needed, because it is his office to determine with finality what is to be believed, in such a manner that it may be held with unshaken faith by all (10 Corpus). In other words, the biblical revelation is not in itself an orderly system and its content cannot be reduced within the boundaries of any system. Yet as a concession to the feebleness of human comprehension it must and should be made compendious by means of scientific rational theology such as creeds and definitions exhibit in summary. St Thomas spent his life in this work but never for a moment with the idea that it could be a substitute for, let alone an improvement on, God's Word to men, which can only be truly known by the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and will only be known in its fullness in the Beatific Vision.

And so finally:

> In the early morning of the 6th December, 1273, at Naples, something mysterious happened to Thomas Aquinas; something which inhibited and paralysed further composition. It was no news to him that, as compared with revelation itself, his *Summa* was like straw; the *Summa* itself had implied as much in its opening pages. But even straw had been useful, if only to show which way the prophetic spirit blows. Now even that was a thing of the past. Revelation had come to him, no longer as a subject for intellectual analysis and explanation, but as overwhelming reality. "I can write no more," he told his companion, "for everything that I have written seems like straw, by comparison with the things that I have now *seen*, and which have been *revealed* to me" (*God and the Unconscious*, by Victor White, O.P., p. 139).

Hawkesyard Priory,
Rugeley, Staffs.
7 *December* 1957.

Yours faithfully,
Henry St John, O.P.

LUKE 20. 34–36

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Does not Robert Browning, through Pomilia, in the *Ring*

and the Book, most beautifully anticipate and confirm the Rev. Maurice Wiles's interpretation in your December number of this saying of our Lord?

'Tis there they neither marry nor are given
In marriage but are as the angels: right,
Oh how right that is, how like Jesus Christ
To say that! Marriage-making for the earth,
With gold so much,—birth, power, repute so much,
Or beauty, youth so much, in lack of these!
Be as the angels rather, who, apart,
Know themselves into one, are found at length
Married, but marry never, no, nor give
In marriage; they are man and wife at once
When the true time is: here we have to wait
Not so long neither!

Jesus College,
Cambridge.

Yours faithfully,
F. J. E. Raby.

DIVORCE

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

A word, if I may, about being "sorry" for remarrying after divorce. If a man thinks he is right to remarry, the question of course does not arise—unless someone succeeds in convincing him that he is in the wrong. He may even be encouraged, if he has read Lady Oppenheimer, to think that at least in some way—"at the individual level"—he is justified in his failure to "witness to the Christian ideal".

A case that is not unlikely to arise is that of the person who was not much of a Christian when he or she remarried after divorce, but who now wishes to take the life of faith more seriously. To simplify the case, let both parties wish to do this. If they are Anglicans they cannot but be made aware that all is not well with their union, though in a less abrupt way than if they are Roman Catholics. Is it a Christian union? Is it in the eyes of God a marriage at all? They have sincerity enough to wish to be told the truth in plain words, and the instinct perhaps to turn to the sort of divine who will tell it to them. Yes, they are living in adultery. What are they to do? They are genuinely fond of one another, but they know that this is not enough in itself to justify their continuing together. The least they could do for the honour of God would be to separate. But they have a family. Roman moralists teach that in these circumstances, with the consent of the bishop, the parents may live together as brother and sister in order to fulfil the duties which they have contracted towards their family and towards one another in so doing, apart from the "debitum", for there can be no such thing outside a valid marriage. No doubt this procedure is adopted from time to time by Anglicans, but the teaching of it might help to clear up the feeling that somehow a marriage after divorce is a true marriage,

because of the circumstances, though not such a true marriage as Christ demands.

He does demand. It is a mistake to think that moral freedom or spontaniety is incompatible with the sense of moral obligation, which is not to be equated with legal obligation though it may be expressed in laws. Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil, and "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all the heart" is still binding, more so than ever. We are *commanded* to *love*, obliged to the service which is perfect freedom. The paradox expresses God's absolute claim to our willing "obedience"—a classical Christian term for a fundamental Christian attitude. The Christian ideal is something that we are free to refuse only at our peril, once we have been called; and for what other end does the Church and its witness exist but to leave us in no doubt that we are called, that we are obliged, and also enabled through all the channels of grace? The Kingdom of Heaven is indeed "more like a family than a state", but in a Christian family there will still be rules, commands, duties, however affectionately imposed, however joyfully fulfilled; and things won't always go quite smoothly, not if the members of the family remain human; some "justice" there will have to be, an occasional spanking before little Johnnie learns to do everything purely for the love of God. So long as God himself does not dispense with justice—for what else is hell? —we had better not do so ourselves. It requires a somewhat sympathetic understanding of the Lutheran perspectives of Lady Oppenheimer's thought not to consign at once to the flames the dictum that "questions and answers about what is just are . . . subchristian". Even so, shades of Maurice and Manning! Whether or not Luther would have agreed with Lady Oppenheimer he soon found himself up to the ears in marriage cases. He groaned, but he settled them. Once, it appears, in the *Table Talk* he even spoke well of the Roman Rota!

Lady Oppenheimer regards Christian marriage almost as Catholics do the vocation to celibacy. But there is this important difference. Though comparatively few who enter upon marriage realize that Christ has hallowed it, that it is for the baptized a graced state, marriage nevertheless is what "the religious life" (as it is called) can never be: a constitutive element in human society. Monogamy—of which polygamy and polyandry are a debasement—is a basic institution in that order founded by God himself, and which sin in the sexual as in other departments so constantly defaces. Only Christians, in Christ, can hope to maintain monogamy effectively, but it remains God's norm and plan and will for society as a whole. There is no alternative that is not an offence to Almighty God, and Christians have a duty to say so. Woe to the Christian who adds to the world's sin and injustice and disorder where marriage is concerned. Well may he be "sorry". Well may he repent.

Yours faithfully,

BEAUMONT. H. D. HANSHELL, S.J.

BOOK REVIEWS

PRINCIPLES OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY. By Bernard Leeming, S.J. Longmans. 30s.

This treatise is a notable contribution to a branch of theology important not only in relation to past and present controversies between Catholics and Protestants but in view of substantial differences of opinion among Roman Catholic theologians. The clarity of the exposition, the wide range of opinions Catholic and other which receive attention, the thoroughness with which these are discussed, and the independence and originality of his thought, especially but not only in regard to sacramental causality, combine to render Fr Leeming's book of altogether exceptional value and significance.

For reasons of space this review must be confined to a single topic, and I propose to try to summarize and to discuss Fr Leeming's treatment of sacramental causality. As would be expected he rejects "occasional causality" on the ground that if a sacrament is merely an occasion on which we know that God will give grace the sacrament is no real cause of that grace. To that issue I shall revert later. He rejects also the view that the sacraments are "moral causes" of grace (e.g. that in the sacraments our Lord impetrates grace through the Church) on the ground that any such view "denies efficiency and reduces the causality to finality". I do not think this consideration is in itself conclusive. Moral causation, a prayer or command which determines the operation of an efficient cause, is a real form of causality. On the other hand I believe a conclusive argument to be implicit in what Fr Leeming says. Unless the sacraments are efficient or dispositive causes of grace it is very difficult, I think impossible, to hold that in the sacraments God the Father is acting through the Son to give grace.

Fr Leeming rejects, after a somewhat devastating but convincing discussion, what he terms the "mysteries-presence" theories held by Casel and Vonier, as being not only obscure but unsatisfactory. (So far as I can see his arguments are relevant also to Canon Masure's Eucharistic theology, with which however Fr Leeming is less directly concerned and which he does not discuss.) With, I think, more hesitation, Fr Leeming rejects Billot's view on the ground that if the sacraments merely confer a title to grace, and thus merely "infallibly designate" the recipient as a recipient also of grace, they cannot be said truly to cause grace. As final stages in clearing the ground, he rejects the view that the sacraments cause grace by a "perfective" causality, since "perfective" causality fails to explain either the possibility of valid sacraments being fruitless of grace or the "revivescence" of the sacraments, e.g. the fact that if an obex exists at the time of baptism but subsequently ceases to exist baptismal grace will result; and, lastly, he argues that the dispositive causation, which he holds to be involved, is brought about in a manner which cannot well be described either as "physical" or, as Billot suggested, as "intentional".

I turn to what seems to me even more important than his destruc-

tive criticism, important as that is, Fr Leeming's own answers. He holds that sacramental grace can best be described as "a reality in the soul comparable to an infused habit". That, so far as I can presume to judge, I wholly accept. Secondly, he insists on the *multiple* effects of a sacrament. Grace as an ontological union with God; in certain sacraments "character"; a spiritual holiness; a new and enhanced relation to the Church; certain obligations and rights. That, again, I wholly accept and believe to be of great importance. It is only when he comes to his final conclusion in regard to sacramental causality that I cannot wholly agree.

That conclusion is embodied in one of the Principles in which throughout the book Fr Leeming's views are admirably epitomized. Principle XI runs as follows:

> The efficacy of the sacraments flows through the union which they cause with the Mystical Body of Christ, the visible Church: in as much as the sacrament, by uniting the recipient in a special manner to the Church, expresses Christ's will to confer grace upon him if he places no obstacle.

After much thought I do not find it possible to accept Principle XI as it stands. I agree that our Lord's promise of grace is in respect of a special relation to the Church in the case of Orders; arguably so in the case of Marriage, although in this case I think the promise is rather in respect of a special relation between the parties; arguably again in the case of Penance, indeed very arguably. On the other hand, I think it is truer to say that we are regenerated inseparably from becoming members of the Church rather than through becoming members of the Church; and that in Confirmation we receive (apart from an obex) gifts of grace and that these give us a special further relation to the Church, rather than the other way round. In the case of Unction the conception of a new form of union with the Church seems to me very difficult, indeed far fetched. As a consequence I find myself driven to a different formulation, but one which owes much to Fr Leeming's discussion, not merely, although primarily, to his insistence on the multiple effect of each sacrament but also to the stress which he lays in Principle XI on union with the Church.

It is, I think, implicit in that Principle (and implicit also in Fr Leeming's convincing defence of the view that Dominical institution of a sacrament is secured by institution *in genere*) that what is fundamental to a sacrament and determinative of its effect is a promise by our Lord of certain special graces. When there is such a promise, a sacrament results either when our Lord himself appointed a specific rite by which the graces in question should be given or when he did not do so, but his teaching or example implied that these graces should be given by some visible rite and the actual rite to be employed has been determined by the Church. Fr Leeming dismisses all secular analogies (including Billot's illustration that the words of a Pope "You are a Cardinal" effect what they say) as being in the "juridical order". He is, of course, right if the authority which determines the effect is human authority, however exalted or however efficacious. It is, however, another matter if an effect results from

a prior and immutable determination of the Divine Will, such as must be held to be involved in a promise by him who was himself very God and to whom all authority was committed by the Father. If behind every sacrament there is such a promise, the sacraments producing their effect in the supernatural order in regard to grace is no more a matter of "infallible designation" or "occasional or conditional causation" or of a "title" to the effect, than is in the natural order the ensuing of a consequence from an action in accordance with the laws which govern nature.

There remains the question what is the precise immediate effect of the sacraments in regard to grace. As I have said, I accept Fr Leeming's conclusion that sacramental grace can best be described as "a reality in the soul comparable to an infused habit". This results if, but only if, there is not an obex. In consequence I think what has to be said is that among the multiple effects produced directly by a sacrament should be included an infused *capacity* for grace such that if there is not an obex an infused *habit* results.

Even in the case of Orders, where our Lord's promise of special graces was definitely in respect of those who have a particular position in the Church, I would hold that, because of that promise, the conferring of the position in question confers directly an infused capacity. It is, however, those sacraments in the case of which our Lord's promises of special graces were not made in respect of persons as having a special relation to the Church (even although such a relation might also result) that appear to me most clearly to demand the conception of an infused capacity.

I would wish to emphasize that on the above view the "infused capacity", as well as the "infused habit", is in the ontological order. What I mean can best be illustrated by Baptism. A new-born child has certain natural capacities, e.g. a "capacity" to learn to walk so that this becomes a "habit", or a "capacity" to learn to think more or less logically so that this becomes a "habit". But in every case the capacity has to be developed to become a habit, and this involves the assistance of others, afforded in and through membership of a community. In Baptism the child is regenerated in that he receives new (supernatural) "capacities" which once received are as much part of his nature as his natural "capacities". But the former capacities as well as the latter require both education and personal effort before they can become habits. Both the guidance and the inspiration to effort which are necessary are, under God, supplied by the Church.

There is involved on the above view that an obex exists unless there is *positive* effort to develop the capacity infused by a sacrament. The departure from traditional thought is, however, in reality very limited. In the case of a conscious adult, who is the recipient of a sacrament, such effort would certainly exist if there were not an obex, even if an obex is regarded in a wholly traditional manner. There remain the problem of infant Baptism and that of Unction of an unconscious person. In either case there is on the above view an infused capacity. I would not, however, for a moment maintain that there can be nothing more unless or until the recipient himself

becomes capable of effort. In the case of our Lord's miracles of healing both faith and petition were necessary; but they were not necessarily those of the recipient. In like manner, in the case of Baptism of an infant the faith and prayers of the Church (and in particular those of the parents and close relations) may well so supply that of which the infant is incapable as to secure that grace results from the infused capacity. Indeed, any other view seems to me to land one in a false individualism. In the case of the Unction of an unconscious person not only is the same consideration relevant but the fact that he or she is unconscious at the moment need not, I should say certainly does not, preclude their dispositions from having effect.

I wish to make one further comment. I do not believe that all the sacraments can be brought wholly under one formula. In particular, as the late Lord Halifax used to insist, there is an important distinction between the Eucharist and all the other Sacraments. What the priest does in the Eucharist is to hallow the bread and wine so that they become, sacramentally, the Body and Blood of Christ and afford as such opportunities of grace to the faithful. In every other sacrament the minister confers, or the parties in the case of marriage acquire, not mediately but immediately, opportunities of grace.

I have tried throughout this review to make clear my personal debt to Fr Leeming's book and I would wish to express my gratitude. I would wish also to acknowledge the marked fairness and generosity of his treatment of Anglican theologians, including myself. Since it is relevant to certain things which I have said, I should perhaps add that Fr Leeming is right in his surmise that I wrote the Appendix on Sacramental Causality which is included in the Report of the Archbishops' Commission on Doctrine published in 1938 under the title *Doctrine in the Church of England.*

Will Spens.
Ely.

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. By Bruno S. James. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

St Bernard has always proved more attractive to the French than to the English mind, and the recent celebrations of his octocentenary produced little effect on this side of the Channel. The massive, well-documented life of him by Watkin Williams (to which Fr James renders due tribute) remains the standard English biography, but there was certainly room for a shorter, more popular, account of St Bernard. This, after careful study, Fr James has set out to supply, and many will find his little book a useful introduction to a churchman who captured the imagination of the contemporary Western Church to a degree which it is difficult to parallel. Fr James possesses in abundant measure the sturdy common sense and fair-mindedness essential in dealing with so highly coloured a subject. He does not gloss over the occasional weaknesses of one who was "apt to boil over like a saucepan of milk" (p. 179) and "sometimes . . . appears to mistake rhetoric for arguments" (p. 48). In the famous controversy between Cistercians and Cluniacs, which attracted so much contemporary attention, he very properly points out that their viewpoints

"represent two different and quite legitimate ideals" (p. 56). The astounding magnetism of one who was the trusted adviser of popes and kings is well brought out, as are the spiritual qualities that produced it—Bernard's intense sensitivity to the call of Christ, his deep devotion, his affectionate understanding of his brethren, his profound humility. The author largely limits his attention to the personality of the saint, and because of this omits or skirts over allied matters others might wish to mention. The book would have been improved by a greater attention to the historical background. The opening pages on this are not convincing and from time to time Fr James throws out perilous generalizations; to say that with Bernard and his immediate contemporaries "the life went out of the body and it took on the rigidity of a corpse" (p. 78) seems scarcely fair to Cistercianism, and equally questionable is his dictum that "with his [Bernard's] death the Middle Ages went into a slow decline" (p. 175). The general reader would have been helped by a few paragraphs explaining the nature of the Cistercian ideal and by a more careful bibliography, to which (in these degenerate days) it might be useful to add details of the various good English translations of the saint's works. The writing of the book is clear and concise.

Pembroke College, Cambridge. J. C. Dickinson.

From Bossuet to Newman. By Owen Chadwick Cambridge University Press. 25s.

For the reader who possesses no more than a general knowledge of the history of Christianity, Dr Chadwick's type of essay seems to me to be ideal. One glance at the apparatus of footnotes inspires confidence, but as it is safely ensconced in the last fifty pages of the book it can be left for the use of the specialist. The eight main chapters (there is a brief Epilogue) were originally given as the Birkbeck Lectures at Trinity College, and they retain the freshness and persuasiveness of the spoken word; they are lit up by apt illustrations and impress the reader both by their obvious mastery of the subject and by their clarity of literary expression. Best of all, the author in writing the history of a particular period enables us to get a clear view of a universal problem which is very much with us to-day—the problem of the relation between timeless, unchanging Truth and its expression or its exposition within the categories of a particular place and time.

One half of the book deals with the period between the early seventeenth and the early nineteenth centuries. Bossuet is set forth as the pillar of unchanging orthodoxy, the Spanish theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the keen advocates of logical explication, the French critics of the eighteenth century as the relentless questioners of the accepted teachings of the Church, and Bishop Butler as the learned exponent of a form of progress in religion comparable to that which can be observed in the world of nature. These chapters provide an admirable view of the historical

setting within which Newman was to grapple with the idea of doctrinal development in his famous essay. The second half of the book shows how he went to work and what were the consequences of the publication of a theory which could so easily be misunderstood. It is a fascinating story and Dr Chadwick is at his best in describing Newman's relations first with the reigning theological professors in Rome and then with the violent American convert from Unitarianism who would have none of a doctrine which seemed to be tainted with the liberalism which he had himself abandoned.

Again and again in his account of the men and movements of the period, Dr Chadwick returns to what he claims was the ultimate theological problem of the nineteenth-century Church—that of the relation between Christian *certainty* and the inevitable failure of historical inquiry ever to produce more than *probable* results. Ward, to whom a whole chapter is devoted, virtually abandoned historical inquiry: the only final test of the truth of a doctrine was whether it had produced the type of saintliness which Ward accepted as authentic and unmistakable. Newman, on the other hand, believed that there was a place for development in history, and so for a legitimate historical inquiry concerning the way in which the process of development had taken place. But the results of such an inquiry could not be sufficient by themselves. There was no such a thing as following the historical trail freely wherever it might lead. Historical inquiry must be checked by moral considerations and the moral authority of the true Church must have the final word.

With the large-scale abandonment of the late nineteenth-century "liberal" view of the historian's function, the questions with which Dr Chadwick is concerned become peculiarly relevant to the theologian's task to-day. His essay should prove of the highest value in that re-examination of the relation between theology and history which is one of the pressing needs of our time.

Liverpool. F. W. Dillistone.

The Diocesan Priest. By Eugène Masure. Geoffrey Chapman. 18s.

Canon Masure writes to supply a need for a precise and scientific treatise on the Diocesan Priest as has been done so often for the Religious State. As an individual the priest is nothing, but his perfection and his function is that of collaborator of the bishop. The service of God and the service of man, in union with the bishop, is the perfection of charity for the diocesan priest. "The thing that binds a priest to his diocese is his love and desire for complete spiritual fatherhood." Priests are in a state of perfection which they derive from the bishop. "It is in sanctifying others that a priest must learn to sanctify himself." He maintains that much confusion of thought has arisen through the common practice of asking religious to conduct diocesan retreats, whose methods of ascesis are foreign to, and even incompatible with, the duties of the secular priesthood.

The second part of the book deals with the spirituality of the

parish priest, which combines stability with adaptability. He traces the history of this spirituality up to the present day, and shows how some young French priests have borrowed their asceticism from Catholic Scouting: the hard life, the loyal life, the simplified life; a modern translation of poverty and obedience. The problem of our time is to exploit the apostolate as a means of perfection, instead of considering activity as a danger, even an obstacle, to holiness. Contemplation is still necessary, but its proportion to action must vary with peoples and times.

The final chapter, on The Community, shows how this aspect of the Church has been neglected in the past. This does not lead to a panegyric on the Liturgical Movement: for he says, "We believe that the setting up of mental prayer, as distinct from prayer in choir, has been a progressive step, that low and private masses are, on certain days, indispensable to modern souls." On the other hand, he has some devastating remarks concerning "a certain conception of the Exercises of St Ignatius", which he compares with the office, the factory and the barracks, where the individual and all that is intimate and sacred to him, are ruthlessly reduced to a common type. He mentions with approval the Seminary of the Mission de France, now established at diocesan level. It has become necessary to adapt our spirituality to new conditions. One small but interesting suggestion is that the secular clergy should have a day of rest (not, of course, Sunday), given to prayer and non-servile work: something very different from the "day-off" of Anglican and Roman secular priests in this country. The secular priest's call to personal perfection is real, even when he "lives legitimately in the 'state of marriage', as is the case of the Eastern Rites".

This is not an easy book to read, but repays some effort. All who are interested in the Church of France to-day should read it. We see here an attempt to grapple with the existing religious situation with a refreshing realism.

It remains to be said, with regret, that the translation appears to have been made either by a Frenchwoman who does not wholly understand English or by an English(American)woman who does not understand French.

CARDIFF DOCKS. B. M. OMAN, O.G.S.

SACRAMENTS AND WORSHIP. Edited by P. F. Palmer, S.J. Longmans. 15s.

This book is presented as the first of a series of Sources of Christian Theology: it is the first edition in England of a book which was published in the U.S.A. in 1955. The contents consist mainly of Christian documents in translation, to which Dr Palmer has appended explanatory notes, and the five sections into which the book is divided contain texts of the baptismal and eucharistic liturgies (parts 1 and 2), texts which set out the development of the idea of the sacramental system (part 3), while the texts in parts 4 and 5 speak of the Eucharist first as a sacrament and then as a sacrifice.

Dr Palmer writes for the theological student rather than the liturgical, and this must explain the rather meagre selection of liturgical texts. Most of them are in any case readily available in this country in translation—the Didache, St Justin, Hippolytus, St Cyril, St Ambrose; but a translation of the baptismal rite in the Gelasian Sacramentary is something new, and it is a great pity that it is not presented more fully and more accurately. Even the exigencies of classical grammar do not compel us to translate *Effeta, quod est adaperire,* by *Effeta, which is to open.* And whatever classical grammar may say, the word *tertio* in the rubric *Deinde per singulas vices mergis eum tertio in aqua* almost certainly means *thrice,* and not *for the third time,* as Dr Palmer has it; and this is a case where accuracy really matters. In an extract from *The Apostolic Tradition,* Dom Gregory Dix's editorial heading *The Paschal Mass* is printed as though it were part of the original text, although this, again, is a point where accuracy really matters. For many years, two schools of thought on the moment of consecration have taken St Justin's expression *by the prayer of his word* as supporting their own opposing theories; one would have hoped that by this time Dr Palmer might at least have been prepared to acknowledge the uncertainty that surrounds it. A few footnotes on doubtful points would have given us more confidence in the reliability of the book. In fact, there are none.

Parts 3, 4 and 5 present us with texts from the Apostolic Fathers to recent Encyclicals, and set out variously the Catholic or Roman Catholic teaching on such matters as the Real Presence, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the moment of Consecration. Brief extracts from the continental reformers are introduced to show their errors. The English Reformation is presented through the Thirty-nine Articles and the books of 1549 and 1552, with quotations from Tract 90 and Dom Gregory Dix. So many matters are presented that there is not very much about any one of them; but this is not to deny that the book offers a useful if rather thin prospectus of the range of the Church's thought on the sacraments.

Kirkby-in-Furness. E. C. Whitaker.

SHORTER NOTICES

Public Relations for the Parish. By George Rowles. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

No Common Task. By George Reindorp. Hodder and Stoughton. 4s. 6d.

Mr Rowles has given us a book which raises important considerations. Its direct purpose is to help the parish priest in planning public relations in his parish, and so there is information about the Press, hand-outs, conferences, exhibitions, personal contacts and the like. Such expert guidance is worthy of more than a cursory glance. Many parish priests have been learning to do these things for

years, perhaps without knowing that they had a dignified collective name like Public Relations. The attempted definitions of the sphere of public relations must arouse interest, especially when it is seen how illusive is the meaning. Clearly more is involved than the work of the parish.

The Church as a whole must learn from new methods in human relationships developed in the world to-day. The sphere of industrial relations alone has much to teach. The Report, *Towards the Conversion of England*, suggested ten years ago an advertising campaign which was afterwards considered too costly; to-day it is increasingly realized that the need is really for better public relations, although the Church Assembly sometimes treats its Information Board as a Cinderella. This book, therefore, is useful not only for the practical purposes of the parish, it also indicates the value of the study of this new field of practice which the Church as a whole ought to foster and develop.

Mr Reindorp is always sure to charm, to amuse and to stimulate. He has a flair for a good title, and *No Common Task* is an excellent name for "An outline of a parish priest's job". Perhaps the very excellence of the various pieces in this book will prevent most readers from wondering what purpose is served in their being published together.

He begins with the aim—a very important aim indeed—of presenting the parish priest's job to the layman and especially to the possible ordinand, and the seven short chapters in Part I, written originally for a church newspaper, do this admirably; so indeed do the two ordination sermons in Part V. But the chapters in Part II could better be described as pastoralia notes for ordinands in training, while Parts III and IV might be papers for discussion in clergy study circles. So in spite of his good beginning, he does not in fact do what he set out to do; he really falls between two stools, and the book inevitably becomes another little pastoralia book.

For the parish priest of the town it will give a pleasant stimulus. It is good for the parson to read books about his job from time to time, so that he neither loses his vision nor lowers his standards. The book has many striking and telling phrases and some quotable stories, but there is a familiar look about some of the quotations given in Part II.

York. C. R. Forder.

The Covenant People of God. By H. F. Wickings. Independent Press. 9s. 6d.

As scholars learn more and more about the Bible, so the layman reads it less and less. Hence the many attempts to impart to him some of the knowledge and much of the profit which the scholar finds in God's Word. Mr Wickings' method is to take the idea of Covenant (which he does not explain) and by means of a series of quoted passages and a running commentary to exhibit the connecting thread that runs through the Bible. He does not adequately

explain to the layman why he transposes passages (for example, Exod. 20 and Gen. 2 follow upon Jehu's revolution), and though the motive is generally apparent to the scholar the book is not intended for him. The quotations are often paraphrases for the sake of intelligibility, the preface says, but, for example, Isa. 6. 3 "with two they covered their lower extremities" is hardly preferable to "their feet" (the layman is not likely to guess that the author is shying at a euphemism). Nor is "Who informed you that you were unclothed?" more intelligible than "Who told you that you were naked?"

Mr Wickings' intention is excellent, but he has set out to explain too much by saying too little. This, we fear, is not the way to solve the biblical scholar's very urgent problem.

McGill University, Montreal. S. B. Frost.

The Servant of God. By W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

"It is annoying to have one's eye distracted and interest diverted by annotations at the foot of the pages." So the recent editor of James Joyce's letters excuses himself. Those who concur may certainly read with pleasure and profit some recent essays on the Servant of the Lord; but they may shrink from this translation of the article in the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.* with its 487 footnotes in less than a hundred pages of text. Those on the other hand who are stimulated by a piece of exact scholarship, diligently performed an accurately printed, together with those who require all the available evidence for their interpretation of a contentious question, will be more than grateful to the publishers for including this among their Studies in Biblical Theology. The book demands a knowledge of the rudiments of Hebrew in order to be thoroughly understood and one would, honestly, be surprised if it enjoys a large sale—but still more surprised if it were not to be placed in every reputable theological library.

The authors demonstrate that in the Old Testament and in late Judaism the expression Servant of God is not used of the Messiah. What *is* found, in the mouth of God, is the form "My Servant", and a Messianic interpretation was accorded by Palestinian (but not Hellenistic) Judaism to Is. 42. 1 ff. and 52. 13 ff., and probably also to the passage about suffering in 53. 1–12. So that when Jesus is given the messianic title *Παῖς Θεοῦ*, it is not being simply transferred to him from the Old Testament; it is qualified by references to precisely these passages in Deutero-Isaiah, which make the nature of the messiahship unmistakable. Their Christological interpretation must derive from the period before the Hellenistic expansion of the Church, and there is good reason for holding that in Jesus' own mind Is. 53 provided the clue for the understanding of the necessity and significance of his death. It is true that few indeed are the occasions when Jesus himself alludes to Is. 53 (never in passages peculiar to Matthew or Luke), but this is to be explained on the grounds that he only allowed himself to be known as the Servant in his private

and not in his public teaching. "Only to his disciples did he unveil the mystery that he viewed the fulfilment of Is. 53 as his God-appointed task, and to them alone did he interpret his death as the judgment of God. Because he goes to his death innocently, voluntarily, patiently and in accordance with the will of God (Is. 53) his vicarious dying for the countless multitude of those who lay under dying has boundless atoning virtue. It is life flowing from God, and life in God which he outpours."

WILFRID BROWNING.
CUDDESDON COLLEGE.

WHITGIFT AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH By V. J. K. Brook. E.U.P. 8s. 6d.

The purpose of this series is to build history around a central figure. Whitgift is an excellent choice for the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, and the book provides a great deal of detail regarding contemporary life. The short bibliography, unfortunately, does not mention Dr Dawley's most readable book, *John Whitgift and the Reformation.* Yet this new biography is well presented and excellent value at the price; it may serve as a useful supplement and corrective to what Macaulay wrote about Whitgift (see Brook, p. 181).

Whitgift's obedience to authority is made plain: his personal kindness and the tolerance towards Cartwright are shown, as well as his own effort to remedy many of the abuses found in the church of his day. We might note that Whitgift himself was a pluralist when master at Trinity, but his salary was very small. There was a strong case for administrative reform in the Church of England and the parson's and bishop's "lot was not a happy one".

The book portrays a Primate who is learned, industrious, a good administrator, upright in his life, who avoided making martyrs, literally or metaphorically, of his opponents. It also helps us to see how past history illuminates the present. Men became very concerned over things which nowadays we would often regard as adiaphora. Should we ourselves consider whether some things which we regard as central in the life of the Church might possibly be peripheral?

H. F. WOODHOUSE.
VANCOUVER.

FAITH, HOPE, AND LOVE. By Emil Brunner. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

This book consists of three lectures given by Dr Brunner in America and we are grateful to the Lutterworth Press for making them available to readers in this country. Dr Brunner claims that there has been no similar systematic treatment of the theological virtues in the past. The book is therefore one which should be of interest to the layman and should also attract the attention of the theologian. The thesis is that it is only when these three great virtues are brought into relationship with one another that we are able to appreciate the full meaning and importance of each in the Christian life. The totality of man's existence is to be found in three dimensions of

time—past, future, and present. Our relationship to Jesus Christ influences our outlook and mode of living in each of these dimensions: our attitude to the past is determined by our faith, to the future by hope, and to the present by love. Past, present, and future all contribute actively to our personality, and so it is claimed that each one of these virtues express the totality of our existence without competing with one another. Faith has to do with the basis, the ground on which a man stands; hope is reaching out to something to come, the conviction of Christ's ultimate victory; and love is the presence of God in the soul enabling a man to achieve right relations with his fellow men and with God.

It is a consequence of Dr Brunner's existential approach to his subject that too sharp a distinction is made between the historic event and the theological truth revealed in and through the event. He insists that what really matters is not the "historic Jesus" but faith in the apostolic witness about Jesus Christ. Yet personal experience or "encounter" cannot be separated from the events which give rise to the experience. Experience without that knowledge of the past which is supplied by tradition is uninformed; tradition without experience is mere externalism. In the quest for truth and certainty we need them both.

Among the many good things in this book one of the most impressive is the contrast drawn between secular progress and Christian hope. All the activism of our Western world rests finally upon despair. He eloquently expresses his belief "that if we continue on the road of secularism . . . as we have done during the past fifty years, we will surely end with totalitarianism. This is proved by history; it can be proved by philosophy".

E. Kenneth Lee.

Horsforth.

This is Conversion. By Joost de Blank. Hodder and Stoughton. 2s.

Re-acting from excesses, many have become confused about the real meaning of conversion. The Archbishop of Cape Town releases the idea from its narrower conceptions. He shows that there are two parts to conversion—the inward act of committal and an outward ritual act, normally baptism. Neither act is complete without the other. He has opened up an important discussion, and in a short space many issues are raised, for instance the discipline in the life of the individual of constant repentance and conversion, and more pressing still the question of what ritual act is to take the place of baptism in a society such as ours, where those who come to the point of committal are already baptized and probably confirmed.

Maltby. Margaret Kane.

Insight. A Study of Human Understanding. By Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J. Longmans. 63s.

This is a very impressive book. The author is a Canadian Jesuit and is Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Gregorian University

in Rome, but the present work is primarily philosophical in character. In it he is concerned to maintain a fundamentally intellectualist metaphysics and epistemology against all types of phenomenalism, and on the basis thus established to rehabilitate the classical approach to the existence of God.

As the title indicates, the author's basic affirmation is that the human mind by its very nature is able to penetrate beneath the phenomenal level of its perceptual or imaginal objects and to grasp, obscurely but nevertheless genuinely, the underlying intelligible being. The thesis is applied to a widely diverse collection of subjects: mathematics, physical science, ethics and psychology are all brought under detailed review, and the discussion ends with two chapters which respectively vindicate the possibility and indeed the authentic validity of natural theology and of revelation. Readers whose interest is primarily theological will, without very much loss, be able to skip from the eighth to the nineteenth chapters, omitting the intervening three hundred and fifty pages.

Professor Lonergan's book inevitably invites comparison with Dr Farrer's *Finite and Infinite*, though it must be admitted that it is harder to read. It shares with that book the intuition which is common to most present-day writers on natural theology, namely that the Gordian knot of the positivists and phenomenalists can only be cut by an open declaration of the fact that, as a matter of experience and not just of theory, the human mind in its cognitive activity is not restricted to abstract reasoning and the recognition of sense-phenomena. Professor Lonergan's range is, however, so wide that it is not always easy to see his tree-trunks for their foliage, and although his sentences are always unambiguous and his argument is summarized at regular intervals the reader may at times find himself somewhat lost. And it is to be feared that many who would have appreciated the main argument if it had been condensed (as it could have been) into two hundred and fifty pages will be deterred by the prospect of reading 350,000 words even at the comparatively reasonable cost of three guineas. One is used to St Thomas replying *ad tricesimum*, but it is a little off-putting when a modern writer begins a paragraph with the words, "In the thirty-first place". There can, however, be no doubt of the importance of this book, and for at least one reader its interest was enhanced by its author's detailed acquaintance with modern mathematical physics.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

Among several interesting articles in the October number of *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* (Faber and Faber, 18s.) are "Chapter Administration and Archives at Windsor" by Mr M. F. Bond and "Anglican Churchmen and the Establishment of the Jerusalem Bishopric" by Mr P. J. Welch. There is also an abundance of reviews of English and foreign books on historical subjects.

THE HOLY SPIRIT AND ESCHATOLOGY IN PAUL. By Neill Q. Hamilton. Oliver and Boyd. 8s. 6d.

The main thesis of this useful monograph is that in Paul the Spirit "belongs primarily to the future" although "the Spirit of the future has been released into the present". Dr Hamilton is surely right in reminding us of the futurist element in Paul's pneumatology; but is it satisfactory to describe the present activity of the Spirit as "merely preliminary" and "understandable only as a property of the future age"? The ἀρραβών may be "merely preliminary" to the full payment in commercial transactions, but this balancing of priorities is irrelevant in personal relationships. For those who are already adopted as sons of God the κληρονομία, though important, is no longer *primary*. The most interesting chapter of the book consists of a critical analysis of Dr Dodd's "realized eschatology" (the author is apparently unaware of Dr Dodd's later acknowledgement that the term is "not altogether felicitous"). Dr Hamilton has little difficulty in showing from Dr Dodd's own commentary on *Romans* that there is still a considerable futurist element in that epistle, but he fails to controvert Dr Dodd's argument that there is a significant change of emphasis in the later epistles, particularly Colossians and Ephesians.

ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY. R. F. HETTLINGER.

SELECTED WRITINGS ON CONTEMPLATION. By Richard of Saint-Victor. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by Clare Kirchberger. Faber and Faber. 21s.

This addition to the series of Classics of the Contemplative Life will seem strange at first to those unused to the elaborate allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament which was Richard's delight. And as a practical guide to mystical prayer it is surpassed by many more recent works.

It will, however, prove of exceptional interest to those who are acquainted on the one hand with the writings of the Pseudo-Areopagite and on the other with the great mystics of later times from Eckhart to St John of the Cross. For Richard presents to us the leading ideas of "St Denis" in a form which became accepted by almost every subsequent Christian mystical writer.

The translation is excellent. The introduction is an admirable account of Richard's place in the development of mystical theology. But Miss Kirchberger is surely mistaken when she equates ecstasy with what St John of the Cross calls "the night of the soul" (p. 43). The latter is a continuing state of painful aridity about which St John's teaching is profoundly helpful. Richard, however, has nothing to say on the subject; and this lacuna would be a grave disadvantage to anyone who were to choose him as his sole guide to contemplative prayer.

There are eight misprints.

EATON BRAY. PETER GRAHAM.

THE BALANCE OF TRUTH. By Kātib Chelebi. Translated by G. L. Lewis. George Allen and Unwin. 13s. 6d.

Publishers and translator alike deserve thanks for offering us this pleasant little book. It is not important: a mere hotch-potch of essays, of varying merit. Kātib Chelebi wrote weightier works, notably *Kashf al-Zunūn* and *Jihānnumā*. But *The Balance of Truth* does two things: it transports us into a world of thought and feeling which, at first glance, differs startlingly from our own, yet is found to have unsuspected links with it; and it acquaints us with a likeable person of strongly individual character.

Retired soldier, scholar, devout Muslim, and theological expert—though in the narrower sense no theologian—Chelebi held a distinguished place in the Ottoman Empire of the early seventeenth century. He was a man of robust common sense and pungent humour, moderate, a realist; and what, intellectually, he was wrestling with all his life—without fully knowing it—was a gigantic historical phenomenon, whose full causes still elude us, but which exerts big impact on the contemporary international scene: the fact that in his time Islam—which for centuries had on the material plane at least been Christendom's superior—abruptly began to lag behind. Always, Chelebi's emphasis lay on the Turks' need to avoid traditionalism and bigotry; to hold reason in high respect; and to study and apply science (especially his first love, mathematics). He was unsparing in demands for reform of the Islamic educational system. And as a controversialist he must have been formidable; specimens of his flair for a shattering turn of phrase bestrew the book.

There are also many pleasing items, of a smaller sort, bearing on contemporary affairs; for example, the lively public discussion, in the seventeenth-century Ottoman world, about smoking.

Quite how far the book's charm is a result of the translator's skill cannot be judged without close study of the original. This reviewer suspects that our debt to Mr G. L. Lewis is large.

RAWALPINDI. IAN STEPHENS.

THE ORGANIST'S GUIDE TO CONGREGATIONAL PRAISE. By Erik Routley. Independent Press. 12s. 6d.

This book is a sincere and thoughtful study of an important part of an organist's work in our churches, in all denominations—the tasteful and artistic presentation and accompaniment of hymns. Here is a book intended, as stated in the Introduction, for "organists of the Congregational Order, and then [for those] whose duties consist primarily . . . in playing hymns".

In this Introduction, Dr Routley first explains his premise that the organist's task is more a ministry than a profession. He himself, an organist, and Lecturer in Church History at Mansfield College, Oxford, was general secretary to the committee formed for the preparation of *Congregational Praise* in 1950. Then came a *Companion,*

the promise of the committee in the Preface to this Hymnal, containing historical notes on all the hymns and tunes, among other matters; now, to complete the venture, the *Organist's Guide* has appeared.

Dr Routley offers some excellent advice on the interpretation and accompaniment of hymns, generally in the Introduction, and specifically in the main body of the book; he is a firm believer in registration which is bright and clear, with plenty of upper work as opposed to a solid and complex unison tone which has so often prevailed in the past. The main part of the book is concerned with helpful comments on each hymn in turn: organists may find new inspirations here.

ERIC FLETCHER.

LLANDAFF.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS: *The Vision and General List of Retreats* (1s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: G. S. Kirk and J. E. Raven, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (55s.).

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS: Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., *The Image of God in Man according to Cyril of Alexandria* ($3.00).

CHALLONER PUBLICATIONS: J. A. Jungmann, S.J., *Public Worship* (21s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Yves Montcheuil, *For Men of Action* (11s.).

CHURCH OF ENGLAND TEMPERANCE SOCIETY: *The Alcoholic and the Family: a Guide to understanding his illness and what to do about it* (6d.).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL: Michel Spanneut, *Le Stoicisme des Pères de l'Eglise, de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie* (n.p.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: T. F. Torrance, *When Christ Comes and Comes Again* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Erik Routley, *The Music of Christian Hymnody* (30s.).

LONGMANS: R. P. Lawson (Ed.), *Origen: The Song of Songs: Commentary and Homilies* (21s.); Henri Marrou, *St Augustine and his Influence through the Ages* (6s.); Richard Kroner, *Speculation in Pre-Christian Philosophy* (16s.); James A. Kleist (Ed.), *The Didache: The Epistle of Barnabas: The Epistle and the Martyrdom of St Polycarp: The Fragments of Papias: The Epistle to Diognetus* [cheap edition] (10s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: E. R. Wickham, *Church and People in an Industrial City* (30s.).

MOWBRAY: F. L. Cross (Ed.), *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (12s. 6d.); F. J. E. Raby, *The Poetry of the Eucharist* (4s. 6d.); R. C. Mortimer, *The Celebrant and Ministers of the Eucharist* (4s. 6d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: John McIntyre, *The Christian Doctrine of History* (12s. 6d.).

PENGUIN BOOKS: J. E. Fison, *The Faith of the Bible* (3s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Trevor Hughes, *Teaching the Bible To-day* [useful for group discussion by day and Sunday school teachers] (1s. 6d.); *Agreed Syllabuses and their Revision* [important for all engaged in the teaching of Scripture] (1s. 9d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Hugh Martin (Ed.), *The Private Prayers of Lancelot Andrewes* (8s. 6d.); J. A. T. Robinson, *Jesus and his Coming* (15s.).

S.P.C.K.: Malcolm Boyd, *Crisis in Communication* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: John G. Williams, *Worship and the Modern Child* (12s. 6d.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (9s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THE MYSTICAL THEOLOGY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH

By VLADIMIR LOSSKY

Recent years have seen a steadily growing interest in the Eastern Orthodox Church, but up till the present there has been no really authoritative work in English on Orthodox theology as a whole.

This is a book which not only reveals the root causes of the divergence between Eastern and Western Christendom, but also by its radical criticism of common Western assumptions, involves a transformation of the whole understanding of the word "theology".

16s. net

LAMB TO THE SLAUGHTER

By Brother GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

This small book is intended as an attempt to get to grips with the problem of the relation of the Christian faith to other forms of sacrificial religion. Many who reflect on the problem of Christian origins have suggested that Christianity is a development from primitive magic. Many who believe that Jesus Christ was an historical character at least suspect that the institution of the eucharist, the empty tomb, and the appearance after the resurrection, are infiltrations into the story from pagan myth. In this book these questions are faced in the light of recent research. "This book is short, exciting and rewarding."—ARCHBISHOP OF YORK in *The York Quarterly*.

7s. 6d. net

THEOLOGICAL ESSAYS

By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE

Introduction by Canon EDWARD CARPENTER

The last few years has witnessed a considerable revival of interest in the writings of the great Victorian theologian. Maurice came to his religious beliefs only after a painful period of inward struggle. He was never afraid to look unpleasant facts in the face, and his intellectual honesty challenges modern man no less than it did his own generation. His theology is still relevant, for he was always painfully conscious of the stresses and strains, failures and anxieties, that make up the day-to-day experience of the common man.

There is no doubt that Maurice intended *Theological Essays* to be a formal and mature statement of his theological beliefs, out of which all his other interests and activities sprang.

15s. net

THE ARMOUR OF SAUL

A reconsideration of the Easter Faith

By F. H. CLEOBURY

The author believes that in the struggle with the Goliath of materialism and scepticism the recent tendency to rely entirely on history and on the authority of The Word, to the exclusion of all appeal to Moral Reason, is to load David with Saul's armour.

The first part of this book attempts to draw out with almost brutal frankness the implications of a denial of the Christian faith in the survival of human personality after death. He defends the Christian belief in the survival of the complete human individual, and criticises all attempts to compromise between this and a belief in complete extermination. In the second part he discusses certain problems of Christian origins, and insists that in the appeal to history we must distinguish between what is certain and what is merely tenable or arguable.

9s. 6d. net

From all Booksellers

JAMES CLARKE & CO. LTD.,

33 STORE STREET, LONDON, W.C.1

PREACHING THE CROSS

J. C. Fenton **7s. 6d. net**

A profound theological examination of the Marcan Passion narrative, with special reference to Christ's Words from the Cross; the substance of lectures given at St Boniface College, Warminster.

GO IN PEACE

"Manasses" **5s. 6d.**

"Manasses" writes in sin, repentance, confession, and forgiveness. He writes simply, yet profoundly, and always directly. This is a book for any season; but it is appropriate that it is published immediately before Lent.

ENTERPRISE IN EDUCATION

H. J. Burgess **25s.**

Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury

For the first time a complete insight into the Church's educational undertakings in the 19th century prior to the first Education Act is possible. In at least two vitally important developments the Church is seen as the pioneer of the future State system.

Published in conjunction with the National Society

A PROFESSED PAPIST: BISHOP GORDON

T. F. Taylor **7s. 6d. net**

The career of John Gordon, Bishop of Glasgow, a supporter of James II, is of some importance because of the investigations made by the Roman Catholic authorities into the circumstances of his ordination and their use of the results in their conclusions of the validity of Anglican Orders. Mr Taylor's study, based on papers left by Dom Gregory Dix, sheds new light on Gordon's career.

Published for the Church Historical Society

S · P · C · K